

Claim 36 and Dependents

Claim 36 recites, *inter alia*, “using a geographic database that contains data that represents geographic features in the first geographic area to compare the geographic features of the first course to the geographic features of a second course located in a second geographic area different from the first geographic area,” “comparing the first performance to a second performance, wherein the second performance is along the second course,” and “providing an indication of the comparing of the first and second performances to the participant.”

According to the Office Action, Fry discloses all the limitations of Applicants’ independent claim 36, except for “providing an indication of the comparison” which is disclosed by Khosla. The Office Action is in error and the rejection of Applicants’ claim 36 should be withdrawn because Fry and Khosla do not disclose all the limitations of the claim. Specifically, the Office Action is in error when it states that Fry discloses comparing the first performance to a second performance, wherein the second performance is along the second course (the second course being in a different geographic area than the first course). Fry discloses a sports-related measurement system having an integral global satellite positioning (“GPS”) receiver and computer interfacing capability. (Fry, column 2, lines 45-48). Fry discloses monitoring performance characteristics between individuals on one particular course in which the individuals can rate their own performances relative to others (Fry, column 7, lines 35-39 and 54-59), not comparing performances occurring on two separate courses. There is no mention or suggestion of comparing a performance on one course with a performance on another course in a different geographic location.

Accordingly, claim 36 is allowable for at least these reasons. Claims 2-8, 11-14, and 17-19 depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 36 and, therefore, are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 37 and 38 are also allowable for at least the same reasons regarding claim 36. Claim 23 depends from allowable claim 37 and, therefore, is allowable for at least the same reasons.

It is respectfully asserted that all of the pending claims are patentable over the cited references, and allowance of the pending claims is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adil M. Musabji/

Adil M. Musabji  
Reg. No. 58,728  
Attorney for Applicants

NAVTEQ North America, LLC  
425 West Randolph Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 780-3054